



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ordinary. In these awards recognition is for merit outside the old classification, which recognized valor only. Suggestions tending to improve the efficiency of the department also receive merit awards. In several precincts a system is being tested which provides certain merits and demerits for various phases of police work. For instance, a patrolman who lessens the number of complaints on his post, who makes arrests showing intelligence or risk, receives a certain number of merits in each case. For failure to prevent crime, failure to make arrests, improper patrol, etc., demerits are marked against him.

In the establishment of efficiency records, it was provided that the men receiving the three highest number of merits monthly, should be excused (1) from three tours of patrol duty; (2) from two hours of patrol duty, and (3) from one tour of patrol duty. In addition to these excusings, at the end of the year the officer will receive an additional six days' vacation.

One-half the time lost in court on a tour off duty is returned to the patrolman by excusing him for that period from the next tour of reserve duty. A night or day off is given to every patrolman in case of a good arrest for a felony involving personal risk. This is in addition to any other award. Another incentive lies in promoting men to acting detective sergeants and increasing salaries of members of the force assigned to the special squads, inspection district offices, and heads of the detective bureau branches.

STATISTICS.

An Eight-Year Increase in the Cost of Crime in Ohio.—The following figures relative to the cost of delinquency in Ohio have been prepared from the "Comparative Statistics for the Counties and Cities of Ohio," published and held as manuscript by the Bureau of Inspection and Supervision of Public Offices. The report of 1906 is the first of this sort published in Ohio. The manuscript reports from city and county auditors for 1914 constitute the latest complete returns for a year. The data for state expenses for the four correctional institutions were found in the "Ohio Bulletin of Charities and Correction," Vol. 14, No. 4, and Vol. 21, No. 2.

The year, in each case, for cities ended December 31; for counties, August 31; and for state institutions, November 15. The figures, in each case, cover a full year, the largest part of which was in the calendar year designated. There is no overlapping of the city, county, and state expenses. The expenditures are net in every case, all income being already deducted.

It is impossible to make a clear-cut separation of expenses on account of crime, because of the manner in which the data have been assembled, and because of the mixture of criminal and other actions in the same offices. For instance, the salaries of judges of common pleas courts and of sheriffs are not wholly chargeable to crime. We charged all expenses of the common pleas courts and of sheriffs and prosecuting attorney's offices to crime, but made no charges of the probate court. This court incurs expenses on account of crime. We made no charges for maintenance of court houses and jails. This item in 1906 amounted to \$528,147.36, and in 1914 to \$1,011,517.14, an increase of ninety-two per cent. All of the jail and much of the court house

maintenance is chargeable to crime. We are, therefore, presumably very safe in charging to delinquency all of the items in the following tables. Certainly some very large items directly chargeable to offenses against the social order we have not so charged. In any event, all items are the same for each of the two years, and, therefore, the percentage increases are valid.

TABLE I.

Cost of crime in Ohio cities for 1906 and 1914. Years ending December 31. Figures summarized from "Comparative Statistics, Cities of Ohio, 1906," and from manuscript reports of city auditors for 1915:

	Year 1906.	Year 1914.
Police Departments	\$2,260,559.00	\$3,500,579.61
Court costs	46,303.59	35,615.31
Jury and witness fees.....	5,698.26	86,016.20
Police Courts	61,697.88	209,516.27
Justices' Courts	57,490.06	62,958.61
Workhouses	230,028.44	459,266.43
Totals.....	\$2,661,777.23	\$4,353,952.43

TABLE II.

Cost of crime to the counties of Ohio for 1906 and 1914. Years ended August 31. Figures summarized from "Comparative Statistics, Counties of Ohio, 1906," and from manuscript reports of county auditors for 1914:

	Year 1906.	Year 1914.
Maintenance of Workhouse.....	\$ 47,166.78	\$ 40,520.48
Clothing, etc., for inmates of Industrial Schools..	31,178.98	436,197.04
Common Pleas Courts.....	855,394.37	1,020,218.38
Juvenile Courts	9,350.24	135,870.84
Justices' and Mayors' Courts.....	60,892.40	88,642.43
Police Courts	47,722.43	59,050.53
Criminals, including salary of Jail Matrons.....	177,776.87	504,143.37
Sheriffs' offices	182,917.88	595,011.76
Prosecuting Attorneys' offices.....	252,374.74	234,447.07
Fees for attorneys defending prisoners and prosecutions by Humane Societies.....	60,895.03	35,776.19
Totals.....	\$1,725,669.72	\$3,149,878.09

TABLE III.

Cost of maintenance less total receipts, including payments for clothing and board of inmates, of the four Ohio correctional institutions for the years 1906 and 1914. Years ended November 15. Figures taken from "Ohio Bulletin of Charities and Correction," Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 47, 49, 51 and 53, and Vol. 21, No. 2, p. 104:

	Year 1906.	Year 1914.
Ohio Penitentiary	\$ 44,430.98	\$ 327,583.07
Ohio State Reformatory.....	101,981.01	291,450.57
Boys' Industrial School.....	114,810.49	184,306.83
Girls' Industrial School.....	50,008.00	105,427.26
Totals	\$ 311,230.48	\$ 908,767.73

TABLE IV.

Summary statement of city, county and state expenses for delinquency for 1906 and 1914, with percentage increase of each for the eight-year period. Total expenses for delinquency show an increase of seventy-nine per cent in eight years:

	Year 1906	Year 1914	Percentage Increase in Eight Years.
Ohio cities	\$2,661,777.23	\$4,353,952.43	64
Ohio counties	1,725,669.72	3,149,878.09	82
Four Correctional Institutions of			
Ohio	311,230.48	908,767.73	192
Totals.....	\$4,698,677.43	\$8,412,598.25	79

Some of these figures are susceptible of explanation through changes in law and practice. The juvenile court was very new in Ohio in 1906. In 1914 such courts were organized in all the counties. In 1906 the Ohio Penitentiary was under the contract labor system. In 1907 an actual profit of \$3,400 was shown. It has been a matter of no little expense to change from a penal to a correctional basis.

The population of Ohio, as calculated by the United States Bureau of the Census for July 1, 1906, was 4,533,064, and for July 1, 1914, 5,026,898. In these eight years the population of the entire state increased, therefore, about eleven per cent. The actual average daily populations of the state institutions increased twelve and one-half per cent in the same time, but the commitment rates increased eighteen per cent. This indicates a speeding up of the correctional work, or rather a shortening of the average residence, probably because of the increased commitment rate without proportionate increase in facilities for caring for the large numbers.

With an increase of eleven per cent in the population of the state, we find an increase of seventy-nine per cent in the aggregate expenses of cities, counties and state, for crime, in these eight years.

During the same period the aggregate jail population for twelve months increased forty-two per cent, from 18,591 for the year ending June 30, 1906, to 26,307 for the year ending June 30, 1914. The actual commitments to work-houses increased fifty-four per cent, and the jail commitments sixty-two per cent. The foreign born among those arrested constituted nineteen and one-half per cent of the total arrests in 1906 and in 1914.

Consideration of the character of the offenses as indicated by the charges affords insight into the reason for rapid increase in the cost of criminality to the people of the state. While the total number of arrests increased only forty-two per cent in these eight years, the number charged with felonies increased from 4,039 to 8,079, or one hundred per cent, those charged with misdemeanors from 8,095 to 10,946, or thirty-five per cent, and those charged with violating ordinances decreased from 2,967 to 2,231, or twenty-six per cent. Stated in another form, only twenty-six per cent of a total of 15,000 preferred charges in 1906 were felonies, while thirty-eight per cent of a total of 21,000 in 1914 were felonies.

TABLE V.

Increases, and percentage increases in jail populations, total numbers of sentences, sentences to the Ohio Penitentiary and Ohio State Reformatory, and the charges with felonies as compared with the increase in the population of Ohio in eight years:

	1906.	1914.	Increase.
Population Ohio	4,533,064	5,026,898	10.9%
Jail populations	18,591	26,307	42. %
Total sentences	4,894	7,036	44. %
Sentences to Ohio Penitentiary and Ohio State Reformatory.....	974	1,595	64. %
Charged with felonies.....	4,039	8,079	100. %

T. H. HAINES, M. D.,
Bureau of Juvenile Research, Columbus, Ohio.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Handwriting Expert Testimony.—Mr. William J. Kinsley, of New York, the eminent authority on disputed documents, died very suddenly on March 25, in his fifty-first year. Mr. Kinsley's work in this field has covered the time during which this specialty has secured a permanent place in American courts. Mr. Kinsley was engaged on cases in nearly every state in the Union, as well as in Canada, and was well known to the legal profession throughout the whole country. His name was first brought into prominence in connection with the celebrated Molineux case in New York, in which he took a prominent part. On account of the fact that this particular case and some others of similar character and importance, depended largely upon handwriting testimony, there was instituted in the public prints a skilled, persistent, vindictive attack upon this particular class of evidence covering a period of several years, covering the time when these cases were in process of trial and appeal. By this means the opinions of thousands of lawyers and laymen were affected in a prejudicial way regarding handwriting specialists. Mr. Kinsley, by his high character and his conscientious and skillful work, overcame this prejudice, and largely because of his work and influence the document specialist is a well-recognized character, at least in the eastern courts.

ALBERT S. OSBORN, New York City.

Civil Service Examination for Promotion to Chief Probation Officer in the Children's Court, New York City, May 12, 1916.—1. Prepare recommendations to the chief justice of the Children's Court on each of the following problems, giving your reasons in support of your recommendations:

- (a) The employment of a female deputy chief probation officer.
- (b) The use of Hollerith tabulating machines in the Children's Court.
- (c) The treatment of high-grade mental defectives.
- (d) The reduction of the amount of time spent by probation officers in court to a minimum.

2. Outline clearly what co-operation you would establish as chief probation officer of the Children's Court with each of the following authorities:

- (a) Police department.